1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7		Judicial Assignment: Hon. Robert S. Lasnik		
8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT		
9	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
10	AT SEATTLE			
11				
12	MAPLE LEAF HOUSING INVESTMENTS, LLC, a Washington company,	Case No. 2:18-cv-01710-RSL		
13	Plaintiff,	JOINT STATUS REPORT AND		
14	VS.	DISCOVERY PLAN		
15 16	TEXACO DOWNSTREAM PROPERTIES INC., a Delaware corporation,			
17	Defendant.			
18	Pursuant to the Court's Second Amended Order Regarding Initial Disclosures, Joint Status Report and Early Settlement dated February 19, 2019 (Dkt. # 25), Plaintiff Maple Leaf Housing Investments, LLC ("MLHI") and Defendant Texaco Downstream Properties Inc. ("TDPI"), collectively, the "Parties," submit the following joint status report and discovery plan.			
19				
20				
21				
22	1. Statement of the Nature and Complexity of the Case			
23	MLHI alleges that TDPI is liable for hazardous substances at and potentially migrating from the property it owns located at 8815 and 8829 Roosevelt Way Northeast in Seattle,			
24				
25	Washington ("Property"). MLHI alleges the hazardous substances were released at or from			

1011

1213

1415

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

gasoline service station owned and operated by Tidewater Associated Oil Company ("Tidewater"), a corporate predecessor of TDPI. MLHI asserts claims against TDPI under Washington's Model Toxics Control Act, Chapter 70.105D RCW ("MTCA"), and Washington's Uniform Declaratory Judgment Act, Chapter 7.24 RCW. MLHI is seeking an award of the remedial action costs it has already incurred and a judgment declaring that TDPI is liable for all future remedial action costs MLHI incurs in response to the hazardous substances. TDPI denies that it is a liable party under MTCA, is otherwise liable to MLHI, and that MLHI is entitled to any relief. Both parties seek attorneys' fees.

The parties anticipate that they will rely on experts to offer testimony on the alleged nature and extent of hazardous substances at the Property; the relationship, if any, between hazardous substances and the historic operations on the Property; remedial action costs incurred to date; anticipated future remedial actions; and the allocation of liability under MTCA. However, due to the limited number of parties and anticipated witnesses, the case, as a whole, should be relatively straightforward.

# 2. Proposed Deadline for Joinder of Additional Parties

The Parties propose that the deadline for joining additional parties be eight weeks after the Court enters a scheduling order pursuant to this joint status report.

# 3. Consent to Magistrate

No.

### 4. Related Cases

The Parties are unaware of any related cases pending in this or other jurisdictions.

#### 5. Initial Disclosures

The Parties have agreed to postpone initial disclosures until the Court rules on the Stipulated Motion to Stay Litigation Pending Environmental Investigation and Proposed Order (Dkt. # 29), dated March 26, 2019 ("Motion to Stay"), in which the Parties requested an

6

8

7

10

12

11

14

13

16

15

17 18

20

19

21

2223

24

25

extension of the initial scheduling deadlines. If the Court grants the Motion to Stay, initial disclosures will be made by the deadline ordered by the Court (the parties proposed August 9, 2019). If the Motion to Stay is denied, the Parties will make initial disclosures within 14 days after the denial. The Parties' disclosure and discovery schedule is summarized in Exhibit A.

### 6. Expert and Pretrial Disclosures

The Parties propose the following expert disclosure schedule:

Expert Disclosures: March 2, 2019;

Rebuttal Expert Disclosure: May 4, 2019; and

Close of Expert discovery: June 29, 2019.

# 7. Subjects, Timing, and Phasing of Discovery

In the Motion to Stay, the Parties stipulate to stay all litigation activities, including discovery, in this case for 120 days from the date of entry of the order on the Motion to Stay, in order to facilitate the collection of data regarding the nature and extent of hazardous substances at and potentially migrating from the Property, and request that the Court enter an order consistent with the stipulation. Because the Court has not yet ruled on the Motion to Stay, and the litigation stay could potentially extend beyond the date the Parties intend if the Court does not set an outside date for the litigation stay, the Parties request that the Court, when it rules on the Motion to Stay, order that the litigation stay expire on August 9, 2019.

The Parties agree that the Federal and Local Civil Rules govern the scope, timing, and other limitations on discovery. At this time, the Parties anticipate seeking discovery, when the litigation stay expires, on: (1) the nature of Tidewater's alleged operations and legal relationship to and alleged control over the former gasoline service station; (2) the relationship between Tidewater and TDPI; (3) facts and expert opinions relating to the timing, source, nature, and extent of the hazardous substances on and potentially migrating from the Property, and (4)

remedial action costs incurred and expected to be incurred at the Property, if any. The Parties will work together to identify facts that can be stipulated in order to limit the need for discovery.

The Parties' discovery schedule is summarized in Exhibit A to this joint status report.

#### 8. Preservation of Discoverable Information

The Parties and their attorneys are preserving evidence related to this case. The Parties have entered into an agreement to facilitate the collection of data regarding the nature and extent of the hazardous substances at and potentially migrating from the Property and will continue to cooperate in the collection of such data.

### 9. Electronically Stored Information

This case involves electronically stored information ("ESI"). However, the nature and limited volume of the ESI do not necessitate the adoption of any procedures specifically tailored to ESI.

### 10. Unique or Extensive Claims of Privilege or Work Product

This case does not present unique or extensive claims of privilege or work product.

# 11. Inadvertent Disclosure of Privileged Information

The Parties intend to enter into a clawback agreement upon expiration of the litigation stay requested in the Motion to Stay or upon the Court's denial of the Motion to Stay. The clawback agreement will provide that the inadvertent disclosure of privileged documents does not constitute waiver of privilege or work-product protection, and that the receiving party must comply with any request that the inadvertently disclosed documents be returned or destroyed.

# 12. Changes to Limitations on Discovery

The Parties do not request any changes to or limitations on discovery beyond those provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	13. Discovery Completion Date			
2	Assuming the Court issues a ruling approving the litigation stay requested in the Motion			
3				
4	to Stay, the Parties can complete discovery in accordance with the following deadlines:			
5	Non-Expert Discovery can be completed by January 31, 2020.			
6	Expert discovery can be completed by June 29, 2020.			
	14. Suggestions for Prompt Resolution of Case			
7	The Parties have no specific recommendations for prompt case resolution but will			
8	identify potentially dispositive issues that can be resolved promptly by motion practice.			
9	15. Alternative Dispute Resolution			
10	Currently, the Parties do not plan to participate in formal alternative dispute resolution.			
11	16. Month Case Will be Ready for Trial			
12	The Parties anticipate the case will be ready for trial in September 2020.			
13	17. Jury			
14	Plaintiff filed a jury demand. Defendant contends that MTCA does not provide a right to			
15	a jury trial. The Parties believe this issue may be addressed at a future status conference or a pre-			
16	trial conference with additional briefing on the matter if requested by the Court.			
17	18. Number of Trial Days			
18	The Parties anticipate that five trial days will be sufficient to try this case.			
19	19. Corporate Disclosure Statement			
20	1			
21	MLHI filed its corporate disclosure statement on March 26, 2019.			
22	20. Dates on Which Trial Counsel May have Conflicts			
23	Counsel for MLHI will be unavailable in August 2020.			
24				
25				

1	Respectfully submitted this 18 <sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019.	
2		
3	VERIS LAW GROUP PLLC	
4	By <u>/s/David F. Stearns</u> Howard F. Jensen, WSBA #25144	
5	David F. Stearns, WSBA #45257	
6	howard@verislawgroup.com david@verislawgroup.com	
7	Attorneys for Maple Leaf Housing Investments, LLC	
8	ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL, PC	
9	By: /s/ Robert C. Goodman Robert C. Goodman, WSBA No. 49144	
10	E. Jacob Lubarsky, WSBA No. 52992	
11	Jon-Erik Magnus, WSBA No. 54691 311 California Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104	
12	rgoodman@rjo.com	
13	jlubarsky@rjo.com jmagnus@rjo.com	
14	Attorneys for Texaco Downstream Properties Inc.	
15	I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Jon-Erik	
16	Magnus, counsel for Texaco Downstream Properties Inc.	
17	Dated this 18 <sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019	
18	VERIS LAW GROUP PLLC	
19		
20	By <u>/s/David F. Stearns</u> David F. Stearns, WSBA #45257	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Exhibit A – Parties' Proposed Discovery and Case Management Schedule  Maple Leaf Housing Investments, LLC v. Texaco Downstream Properties Inc.			
Initial Disclosures	August 9, 2019, or if Motion to Stay is		
	denied, within 14 days of denial		
Commencement of Party Discovery	August 9, 2019, or if Motion to Stay is		
	denied, within 14 days of denial		
Close of Non-Expert Discovery	January 31, 2020		
Expert Disclosures	March 2, 2019		
Rebuttal Expert Disclosures	May 4, 2020		
Close of Expert Discovery	June 29, 2020		
Deadline to File Dispositive	August 7, 2020		
Motions/Summary Judgment Cutoff			

1			
2	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
3	I hereby certify that on April 18, 2019 I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk		
4	of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the		
5	following:		
6 7 8	Robert C. Goodman  Edward J. Lubarsky  Jon-Erik Magnus  ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL, PC  311 California Street, 10 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94104  415-956-2828  □ Overnight Delivery via Fed Ex □ First Class Mail via USPS □ Hand-Delivered via ABC Legal Messenger □ Facsimile □ E-mail / CM/ECF USDC WAWD		
9 10 11	rgoodman@rjo.com jlubarsky@rjo.com jmagnus@rjo.com		
12	Dated at Seattle, Washington, this 18 <sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019.  Sarah Kern, Legal Assistant		
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			